	Case 2:20-cv-02515-JAM-DB Documen	it 99 Filed 04/15/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DEREK MATTHEWS,	No. 2:20-cv-2515 JAM DB P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	EDMUND G. BROWN, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner, proceeds pro se with this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. §	
18	1983. Plaintiff initiated this action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of	
19	California and the case was subsequently transferred to this court. This case proceeds on	
20	plaintiff's second amended complaint filed on December 23, 2019.	
21	Defendants have filed two separate motions to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil	
22	Procedure 12(b)(6). (ECF Nos. 58, 77.) Plaintiff has opposed both motions. (ECF Nos. 79, 94.)	
23	Defendants Walker, Jackson, Huff, Sysonbath and Tout have moved to dismiss plaintiff's	
24	latter-filed opposition, ECF No. 94, as an unauthorized sur-reply. (ECF No. 97.) Defendants note	
25	the filing was directed to "the Defendants in the above entitled case and number" and was filed	
26	subsequent to their reply at ECF No. 82. Plaintiff has requested a 60-day extension of time to	
27	respond to the motion to strike and additionally requests clarification of the motion to strike.	
28	(ECF No. 98.)	
		1

Case 2:20-cv-02515-JAM-DB Document 99 Filed 04/15/21 Page 2 of 2

Defendants' motion to strike and plaintiff's motion for extension of time to respond are before the court. Defendants' pending motions to dismiss will be addressed at a later date.

Plaintiff's filing at ECF No. 94 was docketed as an opposition to the motion to dismiss filed by defendant Pinchback at ECF No. 77. The motion to dismiss filed by defendants Walker, Jackson, Huff, Sysonbath and Tout, in contrast, is pending at ECF No. 58. The court construes plaintiff's filing docketed at ECF No. 94 as a timely-filed opposition to the motion to dismiss separately filed by defendant Pinchback. So construed, the filing at issue is not an unauthorized sur-reply.

For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. Defendants' motion to strike (ECF No. 97) is denied; and
- 2. Plaintiff's motion for clarification and for an extension of time (ECF No. 98) is denied as unnecessary.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: April 14, 2021

17 DLB7 matt.2515.EOT.misc